



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,192	07/18/2003	Bruce M. Ruana	RUANA-001CIC	2668
28661	7590	05/15/2007	EXAMINER	
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD. 1657 Hwy 395, Suite 202 Minden, NV 89423			MAYO, TARA L	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	3671			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
05/15/2007	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/623,192	RUANA, BRUCE M.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tara L. Mayo	3671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4-25,28-50,53-73 and 76-105 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-22,32-46,57-71,80-94 and 102-105 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4-7,14,23-25,28-31,47-50,53-56,72,73,76-79 and 95-101 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4, 7, 23 through 25, 28, 31, 47 through 53, 56, 72 through 76, 79 and 95 through 101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,382 B1) in view of Shomo (U.S. Patent No. 4,660,832) and Oseroff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,848,480).

Kobe et al. '382, as seen in Figures 1 and 8, disclose a system for providing a grip (20) for a hand rail or grab bar (col. 14, lines 36 through 37) having an outer surface, the grip comprising:

with regard to claims 1, 25, 48, 96 and 97,

a skin layer (21) axially wrapped (co. 11, lines 44 through 46) about the outer surface of the hand rail or grab bar and having a top surface (24) and a bottom surface (25);
a stretchable material (22; col. 4, lines 16 through 17 and 25 through 41) having a top surface and a bottom surface opposite said top surface, said top surface adhered to said bottom surface of said skin layer;

a releasable adhesive (34; col. 4, lines 54 through 56) disposed on said bottom surface of said stretchable material, said releasable adhesive configured to adhere to the outer surface; and with regard to claims 24 and 49,

wherein the grip substantially covers the outer surface.

Kobe et al. '382 is silent as to whether the edges of the wrapped skin layer overlap.

Shomo '832, as best seen in Figure 3, teaches a grip comprising:

a hand railing (13a) having an outer surface, a length and cross-sectional circumference
a skin layer (17a) having a top surface, a bottom surface, a first end, and a second end
opposite said first end, wherein said top surface is continuous and flat from said first end to said second end;

a 4-way stretchable material layer (16a) with a stretchable top surface and a stretchable bottom surface wherein said 4-way stretchable material comprises polyester (col. 5, lines 44 through 46), said top surface of said stretchable layer adhered to said bottom surface of said skin layer (col. 5, lines 35 through 37); and

an adhesive disposed on said bottom surface of said 4-way stretchable layer.

Shomo '832 expressly teaches the skin layer having non-overlapping edges as preferred for reducing vibration (column 6, lines 57 through 68).

With regard to claims 1, 25, 50, 73 and 96 through 98, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device disclosed by Kobe et

al. '382 such that the edges of the wrapped skin layer would not overlap as taught by Shomo '832. The motivation would have been to reduce the transmission of vibration to a person's hand during use.

The combination of Kobe et al. '382 and Shomo '832 discloses all of the features of the claimed invention with the exception(s) of:

with regard to claims 1, 25, 50, 73 and 96 through 98,

a light emitter coupled with the top surface of the skin layer;

with regard to claims 4, 28, 53 and 76,

the light emitter being a material selected from the group consisting of phosphorescent chemicals, low grade radiant materials, electrically stimulated phosphorescent material, reflective materials, and luminescent pigments; and

with regard to claims 7, 31, 56 and 79,

the light emitter being activated in the absence of light.

Oseroff et al. '480, as seen in Figures 1 through 6, disclose a grip for a grab bar comprising a phosphorescent material (col. 5, lines 35 through 42) to serve as a luminous safety feature in the dark.

With regard to claims 1, 4, 7, 28 and 31, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of grips at the time of invention to further modify the grip disclosed by the combination of Kobe et al. '382 and Shomo '832 with a light emitter in the form of

phosphorescent material as taught by Oseroff et al. '480. The motivation would have been to provide a luminous safety feature.

With regard to claims 50, 53, 56, 73, 76, 79 and 98 through 101, the method steps recited therein are inherent to the method of making and/or assembling the device taught by the combination of Kobe et al. '382, Shomo '832 and Oseroff et al. '480.

With specific regard to claims 23, 47, 72 and 95, Kobe et al. '382 expressly teach the possibility of multiple backing layers (col. 2, lines 39 through 42, and col. 4, lines 5 through 8).

With regard to claim 23, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of grips at the time the invention was made to further modify the device disclosed by the combination of Kobe et al. '382, Shomo '832 and Oseroff et al. '480 such that it would include a backing layer. The motivation would have been to reinforce the skin layer.

With regard to claims 47, 72 and 95, the method steps recited therein are inherent to the method of making and/or assembling the device taught by the combination of Kobe et al. '382, Shomo '832 and Oseroff et al. '480 as modified above by the teaching for an alternative embodiment in Kobe et al. '382.

3. Claims 1, 5, 25, 29, 50, 54, 73 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,382 B1) in view of Shomo (U.S. Patent No. 4,660,832) and McCalla et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,364,500 B1).

The combination of Kobe et al. '382 and Shomo '832 discloses all of the features of the claimed invention as set forth in section 2 above with the exception(s) of:

with regard to claims 1, 25, 50 and 73,

a light emitter coupled with the top surface of the skin layer;

with regard to claims 5, 29, 54 and 77,

the light emitter being selected from the group consisting of fiber optics and light emitting diodes.

McCalla et al. '500, as seen in Figure 6, show a handle member (20) comprising fiber optics for directing light through the handle member (col. 3, lines 13 through 26).

With regard to claims 1, 5, 25, 29, 50, 54, 73 and 77, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of grips at the time of invention to modify the device taught by the combination of Kobe et al. '382 and Shomo '832 such that it would further include a light emitter in the form of fiber optics as taught to be desirable by McCalla et al. '500. The motivation would have been provide the skin layer with means for illumination.

With specific regard to claims 54 and 77, the method steps recited therein are inherent to the method of making and/or assembling the device taught by the combination of Kobe et al. '382 and Shomo '832 as further modified above by McCalla et al. '500.

Art Unit: 3671

4. Claims 1, 6, 25, 30, 50, 55, 73 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,382 B1) in view of Shomo (U.S. Patent No. 4,660,832) and Bixler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,251,903).

The combination of Kobe et al. '382 and Shomo '832 discloses all of the features of the claimed invention as set forth in section 2 above with the exception(s) of:

with regard to claims 1, 25, 50 and 73,

a light emitter coupled with the top surface of the skin layer; and

with regard to claims 6, 30, 55 and 78,

the light emitter being configured to activate responsive to pressure.

Bixler et al. '903, as seen in Figures 1 through 4, show a ball (10) comprising a skin layer cover (12) having an illumination means (col. 3, lines 23 through 26) which is activated by pressure for warning of an improper grip.

With regard to claims 1, 6, 25, 30, 50, 55, 73 and 78, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of grips at the time of invention to modify the device taught by the combination of Kobe et al. '382 and Shomo '832 such that it would further include a pressure activated light emitter as taught by Bixler et al. '903. The motivation would have been to provide the grip with a means for indicating contact with a user's hand as desired.

With specific regard to claims 55 and 78, the method steps recited therein are inherent to the method of making and/or assembling the device taught by the combination of Kobe et al. '382 and Shomo '832 as further modified above by Bixler et al. '903.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3671

6. Claims 1, 25, 96 and 97 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,937 in view of Shomo (U.S. Patent No. 4,660,832) and Oseroff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,848,480).

U.S. Patent No. '937 fails to positively recite:

a hand rail or grab bar;

the skin layer being continuous and flat; and

a light emitter coupled to the top surface of the skin layer.

Shomo '832, as best seen in Figure 3, teaches a grip comprising:

a hand railing (13a) having an outer surface, a length and cross-sectional circumference

a skin layer (17a) having a top surface, a bottom surface, a first end, and a second end

opposite said first end, wherein said top surface is continuous and flat from said first end to said

second end;

a 4-way stretchable material layer (16a) with a stretchable top surface and a stretchable bottom surface wherein said 4-way stretchable material comprises polyester (col. 5, lines 44 through 46), said top surface of said stretchable layer adhered to said bottom surface of said skin layer (col. 5, lines 35 through 37); and

an adhesive disposed on said bottom surface of said 4-way stretchable layer.

Shomo '832 expressly teaches the skin layer having non-overlapping edges as preferred for reducing vibration (column 6, lines 57 through 68).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to make the skin layer of the patented device continuous and flat as taught by Shomo '832. The motivation would have been to provide the user with a smooth, comfortable grip.

Oseroff et al. '480, as seen in Figures 1 through 6, disclose a grip for a grab bar comprising a phosphorescent material (col. 5, lines 35 through 42) to serve as a luminous safety feature in the dark.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of grips at the time of invention to further modify the skin layer of the patented device with the addition of a light emitter in the form of phosphorescent material as taught by Oseroff et al. '480. The motivation would have been to provide a luminous safety feature.

7. Claims 1, 25, 96 and 97 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of copending Application No. 10/921,057 in view of Shomo (U.S. Patent No. 4,660,832) and Oseroff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,848,480).

U.S. Patent Application No. '057 fails to positively recite:
the skin layer being continuous and flat and having non-overlapping edges; and
a light emitter coupled to the top surface of the skin layer.

Shomo '832, as best seen in Figure 3, teaches a grip comprising:

a hand railing (13a) having an outer surface, a length and cross-sectional circumference
a skin layer (17a) having a top surface, a bottom surface, a first end, and a second end
opposite said first end, wherein said top surface is continuous and flat from said first end to said
second end;
a 4-way stretchable material layer (16a) with a stretchable top surface and a stretchable
bottom surface wherein said 4-way stretchable material comprises polyester (col. 5, lines 44
through 46), said top surface of said stretchable layer adhered to said bottom surface of said skin
layer (col. 5, lines 35 through 37); and
an adhesive disposed on said bottom surface of said 4-way stretchable layer.

Shomo '832 expressly teaches the skin layer having non-overlapping edges as preferred
for reducing vibration (column 6, lines 57 through 68).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention
to make the skin layer of the device taught by U.S. Patent Application No. '057 continuous and
flat with non-overlapping edges as taught by Shomo '832. The motivation would have been to
provide the user with a smooth, comfortable grip.

Oseroff et al. '480, as seen in Figures 1 through 6, disclose a grip for a grab bar
comprising a phosphorescent material (col. 5, lines 35 through 42) to serve as a luminous safety
feature in the dark.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of grips at the time of
invention to further modify the skin layer of the patented device with the addition of a light

emitter in the form of phosphorescent material as taught by Oseroff et al. '480. The motivation would have been to provide a luminous safety feature.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 28 February 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's statement that Kobe et al. '382 fails to teach a continuous and flat skin layer, the Examiner contends that essentially the skin layer of the prior art is continuous and flat. Firstly, the skin layer is unquestionably continuous in that it is unitary. Secondly, Kobe et al. '382 expressly teach the height of the stems being so minute and the density of the stems being so great that the same are not detectable by human touch (col. 9, lines 1 through 10). The Examiner maintains the rejection of the claims as being unpatentable over the top surface of the skin layer of the device shown by Kobe et al. '382 in view of Applicant's failure to expressly teach a flat top surface or to ascribe any criticality to the claim limitation in the Specification, and Applicant's reliance solely upon the drawings for support of the claim limitation.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tara L. Mayo whose telephone number is 571-272-6992. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will can be reached on 571-272-6998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3671

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



TARA L MAYO
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 3671

tlm

10 May 2007